

<b>Permitted Development Rights for Householder Microgeneration – Responses to Questions</b>	
<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
1. Do you agree with the principle of an impact for permitted development?	Yes
2. Do you agree with a restriction on development facing onto and visible from a highway in Conservation Areas and in World Heritage Sites?	Yes
3. Should the restrictions apply in the same way to the other types of designated area?	Historic Parks and Gardens
4. Do you agree that the likely impact of noise should be dealt with by specific noise restrictions based on decibel levels at/in neighbouring dwellings in the way proposed in Annex 2?	No
5. If not, what alternative approach would best address this issue	It would be better to adopt a “type approval” approach whereby equipment manufacturers have to obtain certification that their equipment meets specified noise criteria that would ensure compliance with the intended noise climate as described in the Consultation Paper.
6. Do you support a general restriction on permitted development (as proposed at paragraph 52 above) so as to require that visual impact is minimised in exercising the rights?	Yes
7. Do you agree that local planning authorities should be able to restrict permitted development rights for microgeneration where the benefit from the technology is outweighed by its impact?	Yes
8. Do you agree that the existing protection ( <i>in the interests of biodiversity and geological conservation value</i> ) is adequate?	Yes

Question	Response
9. Is guidance sufficient to address the potential impact on archaeologically sensitive areas?	Yes
10. In addition to providing advice as to the scope of the changes to the GPDO, what could guidance also usefully cover?	Nothing obvious but more generalist advice on the merits of technologies should be published in parallel
11. Do you agree with the recommendations for solar microgeneration?	Yes
12. Do you agree that there should be no restriction in terms of the coverage of roofs and walls by solar panels? If not, what would be an acceptable percentage?	No more than 25% without requiring “prior notification” To allow the LPA to assess the visual impact of large installations.
13. Generally, should the same level of permissiveness apply to solar panels on a wall as on a roof?	No. Because such installation would often project they should be subject to “prior notification”.
14. Do you agree with a minimum separation distance of 5m. to the boundary of a highway or neighbouring property for a stand-alone solar unit?	Yes
15. Do you agree with the recommendations for heat pumps?	Yes except as in 16.
16. Do you agree that the likely impact of noise from ASHPs should be dealt with by specific noise restrictions in the same way as proposed for domestic wind turbines?	No. It would be better to adopt a “type approval” approach whereby equipment manufacturers have to obtain certification that their equipment meets specified noise criteria that would ensure compliance with the intended noise climate as described in the Consultation Paper.
17. Do you agree with the recommendations for wind turbines?	Yes except as in 18.

Question	Response
18. Do you agree that the likely impact of noise turbines should be dealt with by specific noise restrictions in the way proposed?	No. It would be better to adopt a “type approval” approach whereby equipment manufacturers have to obtain certification that their equipment meets specified noise criteria that would ensure compliance with the intended noise climate as described in the Consultation Paper.
19. Do you agree with the recommendations for biomass?	Yes
20. Do you agree with the recommendations for CHP?	Yes
21. Do you agree with the recommendations for hydro?	Yes